

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/903,119

Applicant(s)  
Bradley Dale Mitchell

Examiner  
David J. Wiggins

Art Unit  
2856



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David J. Wiggins (Examiner)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) J. Davis Gilmer (Attorney)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 21, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 15, 29, and 41

Identification of prior art discussed:  
none

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

to improve the textual description of the intended use purpose of this instant invention [by mentioning a fabrication chamber and quality control system or method during the semiconductor wafer IC processing/manufacturing], and to more clearly define the particular features of the instant invention [by stating that the gaseous flow path is meant for supplying gases used in processing & manufacturing integrated circuit structures], and to correct a minor Title 35, USC Section 112 problem of lacking proper antecedent basis at original claim 29, line 07 [the "gaseous flow path"]. Also, discussed was the non-professional quality of the original Figures 1-9 submitted with the specification dated 07/10/2001, so that Applicant might want to plan submission of a new set of improved Figures 1-9 after the application is cast/revised into a futured condition for forcoming Allowability. The Applicant stated that he plans to add new claims relating to deposit & residue condition (in the flow passageways) detecting.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

David Wiggins  
Examiner's signature, if required